

REMARKS

This amendment and request for reconsideration is submitted in response to an outstanding Office Action dated September 18, 2007, the shortened **three month** statutory period for response set to expire on December 18, 2007. Accordingly, no extension of time is believed necessary. In the event that the Commissioner determines an extension of time or fee is due, applicants hereby petition for such extension of time, and authorize the Commissioner to charge any required fee to the Milbank deposit account number 13-3250.

I. **Status of the Claims**

Please cancel claim 53 without prejudice and amend claims 49-52 and 55 as provided above. Claims 49-52 and 55 are now pending in the application. Claims 49 and 55 are independent claims.

Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's citation of statutory authority as a basis for claim rejections.

II. **Office Action Summary**

In an Office Action mailed September 18, 2007, the Examiner has rejected pending claims 49-53 and 55. Claims 49, 53, and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Debry* (U.S. 6,314,521). Claims 50 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Debry* in view of *Stefik*. Claim 51 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Debry* and *Stefik* in view of *Rager*.

Applicant has amended the claims to more clearly recite the features of the present invention and thereby distinguish the claimed invention from the cited prior art.

The present invention is directed to protection of safety of image data which is supplied from a supplier device to be transmitted from the supplier device to a printer not

through a use device. That is, as clearly recited in the amended independent claim 49, as a printing system of the present invention is arranged so that the supplier device manages information indicating a printer which can guarantee safety of image data, to determine whether a printer which notified the supplier device of identification information thereof is the printer which can guarantee the safety of the image data, based on the managed information and the notified identification information, and transmits the image data to the printer if it is determined that the printer which notified the supplier device of the identification information can guarantee the safety of the image data.

The above-described present invention is not taught from the cited reference of *Debry*. *Debry* discloses, from column 4 line 51 to column 5 line 21, that in consideration of “The file server may not want a copy of the file to be stored on the client system” and “The owner of the file may wish to control the number of copies being distributed, e.g., to protect copyright in the document and/or payment of a fee on a per-copy basis”, a printer is arranged to obtain in advance a digital certificate to store it and use the stored digital certificate to authenticate itself to others. That is, a certificate authority to the reference issues the digital certificate based on the serial number and model number of the printer. However, the reference of *Debry* fails to teach that this certificate authority is arranged to not issue the digital certificate but determine whether such a printer is a printer which can guarantee the safety of the image data, and thus also fails to teach to transmit the image data to the printer based on a determination result. Therefore, the reference of *Debry* does not disclose or suggest that a supplier device manages information indicating a printer which can guarantee safety of image data, to determine whether a printer which notified the supplied device of identification information thereof is the printer which can guarantee the safety of the image data, based on the

managed information and the notified identification information, and transmits the image data to the printer if it is determined that the printer which notifies the supplier device of the identification information can guarantee the safety of the image data, as clearly recited in the amended independent claim 49. In addition, the reference of *Debry* discloses that the printer gets a print file from a third party not through a client system. However, this reference is silent on how the third party authenticates the printer. In this connection, it should be noted that the printer of the reference has to obtain in advance the digital certificate from the certificate authority to access the third party. On the other hand, in the present invention, if the printer notifies the supplier device which supplies the image data, of the identification information thereof, it is determined whether such a printer is a printer which can guarantee the safety of the image data, so that the printer which notifies the supplier device of the identification information receives the image data according to the determination result.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the cited reference of *Debry* does not disclose or suggest the present invention recited in the amended independent claim 49.

Independent claim 55 recites a control method for a supplier device such as recited in independent claim 49 and has been now amended in the manner similar to the amended independent claim 49. The above-described discussion applied to the amended independent claim 49 therefore is also applicable to the amended independent claim 55.

III. Request for Reconsideration

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims of this application are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejection and allowance is requested. If a conference would assist in placing this application in better condition for allowance, the

undersigned would appreciate a telephone call at the number indicated.

Respectfully submitted,
Milbank, Tweed, Hadley & McCloy LLP



Chris L. Holm
Reg. No.: 39,227

December 17, 2007

Milbank Tweed Hadley & McCloy LLP
1 Chase Manhattan Plaza
New York, NY 10005
(212) 530-5000 / (212) 530-5219 (facsimile)